Proceedings of ICILLP 2025 Symposium: Digital Governance: Inter-Firm Coopetition and Legal Frameworks for Sustainability
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR27766

A Comparative Analysis of Institutional Constraints and Cultural Perceptual Differences in Singapore's Public Affairs

Yuxiang Xiao

College of Social Science and Humanities, Northeastern University, Boston, USA
1403838262@qq.com

Abstract. This paper investigates Singapore's governance model by analyzing how institutional constraints, including laws, bureaucratic structures and political systems, interact with cultural perceptions among the country's major ethnic groups—Chinese, Malays and Indians—to shape public affairs outcomes. The findings show that while Singapore's strong top-down governance ensures policy efficiency, stability and rapid implementation, it can also appear rigid when social and cultural dynamics shift. Ethnic variety poses a challenge to the homogeneous acceptance of policy but also can provide an opportunity to dialogue, learn and be innovative in the practices of governance. The research findings are that the best policies are those that are able to combine technical mastery with cultural intelligence and thus attain a greater level of legitimacy and societal acceptance among the varied communities. Nevertheless, policies that fail to consider cultural perceptions are likely to create resistance and unanticipated challenges even though they are sound in terms of institutions. The study is constrained by its one-case study, and a longitudinal comparative study design that investigates the coping strategies of different societies in diverse institutional structures in managing cultural diversity would be beneficial in future research.

Keywords: Singapore model, governance, institutional constraints, cultural diversity, public policy

1. Introduction

The governance of multiethnic societies must balance between institutional efficiency and cultural diversity, which is becoming more of a problem in a globalized world. The paper explores the governance model in Singapore through the interaction of institutional constraints such as laws, bureaucracy structures and political systems with cultural perceptions of the major ethnic groups in Singapore such as Chinese, Malays and Indians to influence the outcomes of public affairs in Singapore. The results indicate that, although Singapore has a robust top-down governance that keeps the policies efficient and stable as well as fast-implemented, it may be seen as inflexible when social and cultural forces change. Ethnic communities are diverse and thus pose a challenge to the homogeneity of policy acceptance, but on the other hand, they can pave the way to dialogue, reciprocal learning and innovation of governance practices. The research findings suggest that the best policies include those that are effective to combine both technical knowledge and cultural

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR27766

intelligence to generate a wider level of legitimacy and popular acceptance among various communities. Nevertheless, policies that overlook cultural perceptions are likely to create opposition and unprecedented issues even with their institutional validity. The study is narrow in that it only focuses on one case but in the future, comparative and longitudinal research should be considered in order to understand how various societies deal with cultural diversity through diverse institutional structures.

The term zero to hero perfectly describes how Singapore has managed to become a global economic giant despite the lack of resources on the island, which was one of the most remarkable success stories in the modern history. The country has depended on strategic governance and development of human capital in order to attain unparalleled development regardless of the limited natural resources. As a nation with a powerful centralized state and a multicolored and multiethnic population, Singapore has been able to come up with a unique form of government that combines legal frameworks, bureaucratic efficacy and cultural sensibility [1]. It is this Singapore Model that has attracted worldwide acclaim due to its ability to provide economic growth, social stability and high living standards despite the intrinsic diversity burdens [2].

The paper shall look at the interaction of the institutional constraints in form of laws, bureaucratic structures and political systems and the cultural perceptions within the major ethnic groups of the Singaporean Chinese, Malays and Indians to determine the outcome of the public affairs. It will also focus on institutional strength and cultural diversity as two key aspects of the Singaporean model of governance, the way the city-state balances the governance systems on the top and the cultural interpretations of the policy on the bottom.

2. Theoretical framework and literature review

2.1. Institutional constraints in public affairs

In political science and public administration, institutional constraints are understood as the formal and informal rules that structure and guide political behaviour, limit actors' choices, and influence policy outcomes [3]. These constraints include legal frameworks that set and define the boundaries of allowable action, bureaucratic procedures that standardize administration, limited resources that narrow down Within the context of Singapore, these constraints manifest through People's Action Party (PAP), which has maintained continuous governance since independence, creating exceptional policy continuity but also establishing particular path dependencies.

Singapore has built a unique institutional structure characterised by a strong statutory boards that implement policies with remarkable efficiency, a rule-of-law tradition derived from British colonial governance but tailored to local needs, and highly stable policy frameworks maintained across administrative transition [3]. This configuration creates what Pierson identifies as "increasing returns", which is patterns that become increasingly difficult to reverse over time. Singapore's highly centralised approach to policymaking and governance enables efficient implementation although it also struggles to accommodate to the challenges and difficulties that arises in addressing the diverse needs of its communities [4].

2.2. Cultural perception differences

The way social and political issues are interpretated are never universal but rather, it is conditioned by cultural context. In Singapore's multicultural environment, the country's ethnic composition of Chinese, Malay, Indian, and Eurasian communities compounds this effect [5]. Cultural dimensions

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR27766

theory is a useful tool to explore these differences, especially in terms of power distance (acceptance of hierarchical structures), uncertainty avoidance (tolerance for ambiguity), and individualism versus collectivism (the balance between individual and group priorities). Singapore's unique cultural configuration generates what could be termed as "differential reception" of government policies among various communities. The Chinese majority, making up about 75% of Singapore's population, is influenced by Confucian values and heritage, meaning to say that they would demonstrate greater comfort with hierarchical governance and meritocratic principles, whereas Malay and Indian communities might have different expectations concerning community representation and cultural acknowledgement [5]. These differences are crucial for understanding why technically sound and well-designed policies still occasionally encounter unexpected public resistance or require adaptation during implementation.

2.3. Comparative approaches in public affairs studies

Recent research shows that institutional legitimacy, or the perceived suitability of governance structures and frameworks, significantly relies on the alignment of policy strategies with community values [1]. This is particularly relevant in Singapore, where institutions gain legitimacy not only through effective performance but also by navigating the country's complexly intricate cultural landscape. Current research on Singapore's governance is usually either on institutional or cultural aspects in isolation, creating a significant gap in integrated analysis. Institutional studies often focus on efficiency metrics without adequately considering cultural mediation of policy effects, while cultural analysis sometimes underestimate how institutional constraints shape the expression of cultural preferences. This paper seeks to bridge this divide by examining their interaction in specific policy domains.

3. Institutional constraints in Singapore's public affairs

3.1. Legal and regulatory frameworks

In what some locals calls an exchange of a bit of freedom for peace, the legal framework in Singapore establishes significant constraints on public discourse and political participation through legislations such as the Public Order Act (an act regulating public assemblies), and the Protection from Falsehoods and Manipulation Act (POFMA), empowering authorities to combat misinformation and maintain peaceful order [6]. These laws substantially shape public affairs discourse by establishing clear boundaries for acceptable criticism and debate. One hot topic that remains as an example of this is the Section 377A of the Penal Code, a colonial-era law criminalizing sex between men that continues to be at the centre of public debate despite promises of repeal, demonstrating how historical institutional constraints can persist despite evolving social values [7].

It is visible in the government's approach to legal constraints that they often prioritise and emphasise social stability and racial harmony as overriding priorities. The Maintenance of Religious Harmony Act grants authorities with the ability to limit the actions of religious leaders whose actions and behaviours are deemed harmful or threatening to religious harmony unity, reflecting the government's vigilance and caution toward issues that could heighten ethnic or religious tensions or conflicts [8]. The legal system at play is often likened to "guided participation" in the public matters by researchers. It's designed to foster public involvement, but within certain limits that favour social balance more than widespread democratic debates.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR27766

3.2. Bureaucratic structure and decision making

Singapore is characterised by highly centralised and extremely technical administrative system. Government ministries, as well as statutory boards, are cut out in a finely tuned machine and therefore they can work in harmony to ensure that they can put into place policies, which may be hard to execute in less cohesive bureaucratic structures. Such a set can introduce the possibility of amazing consistency in policies and their practical implementation, but possibly at the cost and trade-offs of flexibility and local adaptation. Singapore is governed by what has been described as meritocratic technocracy, in which experience and performance indicators play a significant role in policy making [9]. However good this may be in terms of efficiency gains, such a method may tend towards the bias towards technical rationality when numerical indicators are given priority over the cultural context [10]. The high level of evidence-based policymaking is incompatible with the knowledge systems that are community-based and work in other frameworks.

3.3. Resource allocation & political will

Singapore has a dominant footprint in major areas of housing, media, and education, which pose major constraints to the operation of the affairs of the populace. Singaporeans occupy about 80 percent of housing in stipulated residential complexes by the Housing and Development Board, which leaves the state with immense control over residential trends and community add-up [9]. This is also transferred to the media where most of the large media houses tend to reflect the opinion of the government and the education system where national values and technical skills are taught.

The allocation of resources is based on well defined national priorities and strategic areas are heavily funded whereby the low priority areas work with limited resources [2]. This priority-based system has yielded excellent outcomes in specific fields, but can lead to so-called policy selectivity which is the presence of some issues that receive a disproportionate amount of attention, and some that are left relatively unfixed. The high presence of the state in the allocation of resources is associated with path dependencies that may be hard to alter even in cases where culture may be inclined towards policy change.

4. Cultural perception differences in public affairs

4.1. Multicultural identity and national narrative

Singapore official multiculturalism is based on what is referred to as CMIO (Chinese, Malay, Indian, Others) racial framework that organizes most of the public policy, such as ethnic integration quotas in housing and even political representation [6]. This institutional multiculturalism has been able to inhibit overt ethnic conflict but it also puts limitations on the expression and development of cultural identities. The national discourses promote multiracial harmony as a key value to the extent that they begin to learn about other cultures at a young age during their school years with days like the Racial Harmony Day where they put on cultural fits to school instead of their uniform [6]. One such example is when a prominent Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew at the time called Singapore a rojek (local salad with many odd and unforeseen ingredients falling into place) where separate parts form an overall whole.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR27766

4.2. Confucian heritage and governance acceptance

The Chinese majority's cultural framework, influenced by Confucian heritage, creates particular receptivity to meritocratic governance and hierarchical decision-making [11]. This cultural orientation produces what might be termed "deferential engagement", a respect for authority figures combined with expectations of competent governance [11]. The cultural comfort with hierarchy enables policy approaches that might face greater resistance in societies with different cultural traditions.

Table 1. Cultural dimensions across singapore's ethnic groups

Cultural Dimension	Chinese Community	Malay Community	Indian Community
Power Distance	High acceptance	Moderate acceptance	Moderate acceptance
Uncertainty Avoidance	High	Moderate	Moderate to High
Individualism	Collectivist	Community Oriented	Family-Centred
Governance Expectations	Meritocratic Excellence	Representative inclusion	Recognition of diversity

These cultural dynamics shape distinct expectations of government roles across Singapore's ethnic communities. Singaporean Chinese tend to put lot of value on quick and smooth service while Malay and Indian communities on the other hand often focus more on descriptive representation caring more about having their cultural needs noticed and respected.

4.3. Generational shifts and global influence

The younger Singaporean generations of all types of ethnicity now absorb cultural attitudes not so much due to grandparents or tradition as to a broad conglomeration of world influences, courtesy of school, travel and digital media [5]. This is what Surendran calls "cosmopolitan expectations" and puts the issues of individual expression, participation in politics and social justice much higher on the agenda than past generations [12]. At times, these ideals may conflict with the Singaporean system of orderly politics, creating tension with such provocative issues as LGBTQ+ rights, environmental activism, and inequality of income.

Singaporean young people are much more tolerant toward different sexual orientations as compared to older generations, which reflects the gap of generational differences that become evident concerning sexuality and gender [12]. This instils a never ending tug-of-war between institutionalised restrictions like Section 377A and dynamically shifting cultural views. The LGBTQ+ rights movement, the Pink Dot movement, is gaining extensive support especially among younger citizens of all ethnicities, yet the conservative religious communities still have a severe impact on the political discussion.

5. Comparative analysis of intersections and divergences

The way people think and Singapore's rules sometimes click together, but sometimes they cause real trouble across different areas of policy. When it comes to things like running economy or handling the public housing, the methods of the state usually fit neatly with what different communities want. People are often willing to go along with it so that things usually work out.

The idea that hard work and results should pay off sits well with values in Chinese culture, this is why the state's emphasis on meritocracy resonates with the Chinese people as they value reward advancement based on achievement. The big public housing programs Singapore rolls out also

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR27766

connect with strong wish of the people to own a home. Those programs even go out of their way to mix up ethnic groups in each area by setting quotas.

Aside from generational gaps, race people also another flashpoint. The government takes careful approach to handling ethnic relations mostly through things like Ethnic Integration Policy, which prevents racial concentration in housing estates, keeping any one racial group from clustering together in public housing. However, a lot of younger Singaporeans, whatever their background, want to talk more openly about racism and privilege. Critics argue these official measures which are supposed to keep peace sometimes shut down much-needed conversations about real and lasting unfairness. In the name of harmony, some feel progress gets stalled.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, looking at the public affairs of Singapore, the push and pull between strict rules and how people really see culture stands out. The nation's top-down governance model undeniably has its perks like policies rolling out faster without bumps. Still, that same strong grip can sometimes feel too rigid when other aspects continues to shift. The differences between the ethnic communities can make it hard to get everyone together under one set of rules, but at the same time, it sparks fresh ways for them to talk, learn and come up with new ideas together.

In a mixed place like Singapore, people cannot just order to check on the public institutions on whether they are getting things done or not. Instead, individuals desire to observe that these regulations applies to all categories of communities in the nation they belong to. Technical expertise combined with cultural intelligence in policies that achieve the greatest success in terms of attracting wider acceptance. On the other side of the coin, when the government implements what seems to be okay on paper but they have not taken into consideration how their citizens feel or think, resistance occurs occasionally and issues that the planners had never imagined will emerge.

The next step would be to adopt a comparative perspective in the future research, and explore the ways other societies with different institutional arrangements would handle cultural diversity in their public policy. The longitudinal research of the development of institutional and cultural processes across generations would also provide useful information on these complicated processes.

References

[1] Chua, B. H. (1995) Communitarian Ideology and Democracy in Singapore, Routledge.
[2] Tan, K. P. (2012). 'The Ideology of Pragmatism: Neo-liberal Globalisation and Political Authoritarianism in Singapore', Journal of Contemporary Asia, 42(1), pp. 67-92.
[3] Ortmann, S. and Thompson, M. R. (2016) 'China and the "Singapore Model"', Journal of Democracy, 27(1), pp. 39-48.
[4] Pierson, P. (2000) 'Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics, American Political Science Review, 94(2), pp. 251-267.
[5] Rahim, L.Z. (2009) Singapore in the Malay World: Building and Breaching Regional Bridges, Routledge.
[6] Vasu, N. (2012) 'Governance through Difference in Singapore Corporatism's Composition, Characteristics, and Complications', Asian Survey, 52(4), pp. 734-753.
[7] Chen, J. (2013) 'Singapore's Culture War over Section 377A: Through the Lens of Public Choice and Multilingual Research', Law & Social Inquiry, 38(1), pp. 106–137.
[8] George, C. (2007) 'Consolidating authoritarian rule: Calibrated coercion in Singapore', The Pacific Review, 20(2), pp. 127-145.
[9] Ho, K. L. (2018) 'The People's Action Party of Singapore: Legacy and Renewal', Routledge Handbook of the Contemporary Philippines, pp. 243-254.
[10] Pandian, S., & McGonigle, I. (2024) 'Engineering Trust in Singapore's Covid-19 Response: Political Technocracy, Statistical Rhetoric, and Digital Democracy', East Asian Science, Technology and Society.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR27766

[11] Tan, S. H. (2024) 'Merit and Inequality: Confucian and Communitarian Perspectives on Singapore's Meritocracy', Journal of Confucian Philosophy and Culture, 41(1), pp. 29–63.
[12] Surendran, S., Earp, B. D., Voo T. C. and Dunn, M. (2025) 'Gender identity development and coming out among transgender and gender diverse youth: A qualitative study on youth and parental experiences in Singapore', International Journal of Transgender Health.